

Humanity and Technological Acceleration: Stakes and Challenges Towards an Anticipatory Philosophical Vision in the Thought of the Alvin Toffler

Sabrina BELLOUT^{1*}

¹ Ibn Khaldoun University, Tiaret, (Algeria) sabrine.philo@yahoo.com

Received: 10/11/2025

Accepted: 15/02/2026

Published 12/04/2026

Abstract:

Amid the rapidly accelerating global turn towards all that is technological and informational, it has become imperative for human beings to apprehend the balances of power and harness them in their service in ways that enhance their quality of life and increasingly permit adaptation to it. This is particularly the case given that the formidable tide of technology is no longer merely a scientific–technological acceleration but has come to constitute a striking power within the horizon of a changing world. From this starting point, this research paper seeks to offer an analytical philosophical reading from the perspective of the philosopher of life and futurologist, the American thinker Alvin Toffler, and to examine the anticipatory vision, grounded in philosophical rationality, that he elaborated in a series of works regarded as pioneering in predicting many issues that soon became realities we experience today. Toffler is thus considered one of the key framers of the contemporary human scene in the context of technological acceleration and the stakes and challenges it poses, which are reshaping the world. The study in frame of phenomenology of technology can be touched on a series of Roding given by Alvin Toffler in which he tried to monitor the present -day events and the anticipation of future trends.

Accordingly, what are the dimensions of Toffler's anticipatory vision of the human future? What are the principal mechanisms and instruments for meeting the challenges of survival, adaptation, and continuity in the age of technology?

Keywords: technological acceleration; information revolution; authority of knowledge; human being; future; power; civilisational transformation.

* Corresponding author

1. INTRODUCTION

Within the context of contemporary digital and technological transformations and the critical and dangerous turning points they produce for human beings in their lives, orientations, and principles, even though the need to comprehend these transformations and adapt to them, with their various novelties of informational and technological revolution, which have led the world to adopt a different path in all fields and across the various harbours of life has become an inevitable necessity, the matter is no longer merely a form of technical acceleration and scientific development. Instead, technology has become a driving force in the world, controlling it and affecting its course on a perilous upwards trajectory that has begun to trouble humanity and rearrange the balances of power, leading to even greater peril.

This is because the power of technology in fact signifies its material authority in opposition to the authority and being of the human being, which renders the latter subordinate to it, drawn into its centrality that prevents him from apprehending himself in his changing world. This calls for a renewed understanding of specific concrete contents, the unravelling of what remains obscure within them, and work on dismantling their material structure so that human beings may apprehend themselves and determine their position in relation to the ongoing change and the psychological and social fragmentation it causes for individuals and societies.

On the basis of the aforementioned considerations, attention will be directed to what the thinker and futurologist Alvin Toffler has proposed in terms of philosophical analysis through grounded, realistic anticipatory theses that mirror the nature of today's world and the rapid changes that pervade it, in the form of a future-oriented invocation in which the man that is, Toffler stakes the fate of humanity in the context of technological acceleration

and, consequently, the human being's openness to the nature of this acceleration and all the stakes and challenges it poses, especially the latter, which have exhausted human energy in the attempt to adapt to them.

Toffler's conception was not delimited and was confined to a particular society and time, even though it originated from his approach to American society. In contrast, it is a conception that does not submit to such frameworks, as it lays the foundations for institutional work with an anticipatory vision that bears concern for the human being wherever they may be and wherever they are found. He also went further than this, endowing his vision with concrete implications by orienting it towards a human and global future.

Thus, the outputs of the Tofflerian discourse encompass current developments and their future dimensions in terms of essence and human presence, in addition to the adjustment and balancing of the law of supply and demand in the market of technological transformation. This directly leads us to the shocks to which the human being is exposed in the maze of that transformation, which day after day reaches the height of its power in producing reality and controlling it, a transformation that absorbs what precedes it of developments to reproduce values for its own account, without regard for the calculations of the human being and all that affects him and is affected by him. The inability of a human being to comprehend the current technological situation and prepare for it, as we have indicated, may lead to shocks that Toffler calls "future shock."

In extension of the same vision, Toffler devoted a number of his works, in an apparent effort to trace the contents of lived reality within the expanse of technological transformation, in a famous trilogy, or what is known as Toffler's "future trilogy": *PowerShift*, *The Third Wave*, and *Future Shock*. In these, he articulated a set of conceptions and

predictions that were able to lay the foundations for a philosophical thought concerned with shaping real life, on the basis of an active standpoint that elicits the future and diagnoses its shocks, its stakes, and its transformations, which have consistently dispossessed the human being and undermined his values and morals in the direction of his alienation, in contrast with the stakes of technology and its imposition of the principle of the survival of the strongest, that is, the power of knowledge-based authority.

Moreover, discussion of the future remains at the very core of Toffler's concerns, in a manner that reorients the course of humanity within the shelter of the third wave and all that realises the natural balance of the human being and his openness to the horizon of this stage for the better. At this point, it becomes necessary to ask about the dimensions of Toffler's anticipatory vision and the extent to which it frames the contemporary human scene in the context of technological acceleration and all the stakes and challenges it poses.

2. Civilisational Advancement between the Turning Point of Development and the Pitfalls of Transformation

The discussion of the chronological trajectory of civilisational advancement cannot be separated from the turning points and challenges with which human beings have collided in the context of their civilisational development and their openness to various sciences, as well as the ensuing intellectual and applied revolution. The past few decades have witnessed enormous developments in diverse fields of knowledge, such that the present age has been given various appellations, such as the information explosion, the age of scientific and cognitive revolution, the information age, and the information war as a controlling force in the changing world. Within this context, the progress of states is no longer measured by the amount of information they possess but by their capacity to utilise that information in the service of individuals and societies. Here, the nature of the stake and the challenge posed by contemporary scientific and cognitive revolutions becomes evident.¹

This description applies to confronting the challenges accompanying the information explosion (the information war) and the moral, psychological, and social implications it creates in light of the material, utilitarian vision that governs the use of development tools. This has created a crisis of a widening gap between contemporary human beings and their changing reality. This gap has produced a formidable technological acceleration, particularly with the coming of age of the world through advanced knowledge and technical inventions such as the computer, and with the beginning of the race of sciences, whose early stages witnessed a clear victory for human knowledge and the consolidation of numerous theories such as relativity, as well as entry into the realm of highly specialised disciplines, space discoveries, and advances, especially in the human and social sciences. Thus, knowledge has been the primary source of the emergence of globalisation and the daily expansion of its horizon.²

The trajectory of the developments experienced by humanity has thus continued within the framework of the question of the constant and the variable, as part of a series of contemporary questions concerning the human being's relationship with technological acceleration. These questions culminate in a clash and conflict whose historical outcomes are condensed in favour of technology. Anyone who contemplates the development of human life observes the emergence of two golden ages: the age of agriculture and the age of industry. However, neither has had the profound impact left by the digital or informational age, with challenges that are difficult to overcome. According to Belakroun Abd al-Razzaq, anyone who fails to manage their existence in accordance with the modalities of technology is destined for marginalisation and exclusion from the digital age.³

This is precisely what the thinker and futurologist Alvin Toffler first delineated in an institutional anticipatory framework through his work, the third wave, in which he examines

the history of human thought, articulating an apparent paradox in the trajectory of civilisational transformation towards advancement on the basis of waves of human development. By these waves, as previously indicated, he refers to the first wave of change, namely, the agricultural revolution, and the second wave, referring to the Industrial Revolution in the late eighteenth century. Toffler's principal concern, however, is the third wave because it is the greatest, the fastest, and the most shocking:

‘...The first wave of change, the agricultural revolution, required thousands of years to be completed, and the second wave, the rise of the industrial civilisation revolution, required only three hundred years. Today, however, in an age of unprecedented historical acceleration, it is more likely that the third wave will surge through history and be completed within a few decades, and everyone destined to live on this planet at this explosive moment will experience the full shock of the third wave in the life of this generation’.⁴

That is, the difficulty of keeping pace with rapid development in the third wave is accompanied by human shocks, as well as intellectual, psychological, social, and even moral fragmentation.

The third wave has indeed brought with it signs of change by affecting radical and rapid transformations in various domains of life, and these transformations may be accompanied by a future that is more developed and more balanced and in which the future of the human being will be understood. Notably, Toffler has drawn the main line of development in the history of civilisations between stability and change and the possibility of a changing tomorrow on the basis of the outcomes embodied in his conception of the third wave as a phase that regulates the rhythm of civilisational advancement. Thus, from the second civilisation, the 'industrial wave', to the postindustrial civilisation, the 'third wave', which, although it arose from within the second wave, was soon separated from it by an extensive margin.

~~This is indeed what has happened, for the wave of the third civilisation~~ possesses its own new and renewing logic and its particular nature, derived from renewable and diverse energy sources. Consequently, the status of factories, the inflation of production, and the disappearance of their value have all become evident due to the emergence of what is known as electronic cottage, the locus of nuclear families. From Toffler's perspective, the new civilisation lays the foundations for what lies beyond synchronisation, centralisation, and standardisation, for it is, in short, a new vision for understanding the world and changing intellectual structures in dealing with time, technology, and the future.⁵

If we return to Toffler's conceptions, we find them to be grounded, placing a finger on the wound and extrapolating today's reality. The predictions he advanced, which current reality has confirmed, indicate that we are not mistaken in regarding Toffler as one of the most important framers of the human future and of contemporary life, supported by his compelling arguments. Work is no longer confined to the company or the factory. Industries have undergone a qualitative transformation in the computer and electronics sectors, as the most important industrial currents of the future, which will affect the work of both large and small institutions, in addition to the development of the quality of work by virtue of the quality of the advantages it offers, such as working at home "the electronic home" and "teleworking".⁶

2.2 . Civilisational transformation for survival and conflict theory

The emergence of the third wave was accompanied by the birth of postindustrial society and a series of sweeping slippages towards it, which was necessarily accompanied by intense and conflicting social and political struggles. These formed the primary focus of Toffler's analyses in light of conflict theory, by which we mean one of the most important theories in the field of sociology for explaining social and civilisational transformation on the

basis of the residues of conflict between classes and forces, or what is known as the opposed and conflicting interests within society. Conflict gives rise to the existing divergence in the interests and goals of the contending parties, while each party seeks to realise its own interest by different means and methods. Conflict is a central and fundamental concept in conflict theory, particularly since societies are not always homogeneous; instead, they present contradictions that spark ongoing struggles for power and authority. Karl Marx is regarded as one of the most important theorists of this theory, in which he considered class conflict to be the motor of history.⁷

Social transformation is the offspring of conflicts of interest, and conflicts also realise positive dimensions that lie in development and advancement. Thus, conflict theory is the most important justification for civilisational transformation resulting from socially, economically, and politically conflicting forces. Every civilisational transformation is caused by a conflict between the forces of change and the forces that preserve tradition. In the same context, Toffler links conflict theory with his concept of waves, stating: 'When I speak of a wave of historical change surging over a society, I am not talking about a single, qualitative change in the technological sector, for example but about an entire series of successive changes that reinforce one another and accelerate one another...'.⁸

From the first wave to the second wave, the changes in ways of life and social, political, and religious institutions transformed the form of conflict, with this transformation extending to encompass everything, sweeping away what remained of the first and second waves. This led to the emergence of familial, social, and religious conflicts, and work shifted from the home to the factory.

The main idea that guided the minds of intellectuals, businesspeople, politicians, and all people in the industrial age was that the dynamic of the future lay in industry at the expense of agriculture. However, with the emergence of the third wave and the more

advanced technological horizon it contains, people are increasingly aware of the necessity of change towards what is more promising and of higher quality. In Toffler's view, the current situation calls for a comparison between what was, what is, and what may be, through acceptance of the inevitable present, driven by the force of change with all its developments, for the sake of material and moral stability, even though the clash of fronts and the outbreak of conflicts is inescapable; indeed, it has repercussions for historical transformation toward what is of greater importance and more profound significance.⁹

On the basis of the aforementioned grounds, Toffler affirms the importance of recognising the evolutionary tide produced by waves upon societies without regard to the clash of forces arising from class, race, or authority barriers. This, in turn, brings about a change and diversification in the orientations of thought. For him, the conflict between civilisations constitutes an overarching battle, and in its light, other conflicts are measured along a path towards fragmentation. This is the significance of conflict theory, which is based on waves of change. Civilisations in general differ significantly according to their position in relation to temporal developments, and economic and strategic changes remain the decisive and most profound indicators in the conflict of civilisations.

2.2. The family as a model in the context of the third wave

The family has undergone qualitative transformations, both in lifestyle and in relationships. Whereas families once experienced crowded living conditions within large houses inhabited by a group of individuals sharing the same roof and participating in work as a single economic production unit in a fixed place, within narrowly defined frameworks and rules that did not extend beyond the bounds of the shared household, a patterned work limited to upbringing and healing by traditional methods and means that the family constituted the nucleus of the social world. With the advent of the Industrial Revolution,

however, the family system underwent significant changes following the clash between paternal authority and the son's expression of his needs, marking the beginning of new relationships between fathers and sons, as well as within the family as a whole.

The family was no longer that compact, shared unit, and the reason behind this was lifestyle change. The father no longer worked within the large household but in a distant location; thus, the concept of the nuclear family emerged. This means that the small, independent family consists of a father, a mother, and their children. It is called "nuclear" because it represents the nucleus of society. The nuclear family model became the familiar family pattern in the modern period, distinct and suited to meeting the needs of industrial society and of shared life through independent and organised relationships, which helped bring about the emergence of hierarchical authority and the separation between family life and work and hence the organisation of tasks according to specialisation and need.¹⁰

With the third wave, conditions changed, and the pace of life accelerated, becoming more advanced, including those within the family. The nuclear family was no longer the ideal model for society and for the nuclear lifestyle, even though the countries of the world have not witnessed the complete decline of nuclear families, as happened with cohesive families during the first wave. The coming wave restored the home to its lost status during the Industrial Revolution. The stage of technological progress and contemporary means of communication prepare the way for the individual to work within his or her home, with the possibility of educating children at home ("homeschooling"). In addition, the civilisation of the third wave permits openness to a balanced familial reality, in which roles are exchanged between the two sexes. From this perspective, the social system, according to Toffler, is on the verge of an explosive wave of renewal and the construction of more effective rules while also posing new problems arising from diverse relationships.

In general, families in the third wave will experience greater openness to social

relationships and a strengthening of family bonds, owing to the availability of sufficient time, which enables individual capacities for innovation and creativity. A culture of participation will spread from the home to society, and upbringing will be more persuasive and more conscious because it is rooted in shared experience. External tasks and some services are also transferred to the home, leading to a growing role for the family and reinforcing a culture of family connectedness and solidarity.

3.2 The power of authority towards the establishment of the authority of knowledge

At the beginning of his book *PowerShift*, Toffler defines the nature of authority as being innocent to all the accusations directed against it because the issue concerns the nature of human relations. This is because the human being is one of the direct products of authority, especially in the contemporary period (as an age of new authorities), in which authority will experience a disintegration of its traditional global structure and assume a new form that is different at all levels, even though authority is present with us and controls us and the fate of our relationships; this is what Toffler affirms. In addition, authority changes with changes in relations and with the growth of human, scientific, and historical transformations. He considers the age of the information explosion to be reordering the balances of power in the face of the emergence of diverse and multiple authorities that weaken the old authority; history will witness a marked upheaval in authority.¹¹

Thus, technological acceleration and scientific development will herald the emergence of new authorities along a dynamic and pragmatic trajectory, even though Toffler's concept of authority differs from its traditional definition, as it encompasses not only money, force, and knowledge but also the broader realm of influence. He explains that the global structure of traditional authority has begun to experience a decline to the point of being subsumed within the information and technological revolution, tracing a straight line towards

unprecedented fragmentation and dissolution. We find him adducing the world of business as evidence, citing in this regard the giant corporations in their reshaping and rebuilding to conform to the requirements of the new global reality: from the decline of the role of workers due to the machine to the invasion of knowledge as the primary indicator in the creation of wealth and the strongest factor in harnessing forces.¹²

Toffler's choice of *PowerShift* as the title of one of his most important works was not arbitrary; rather, it was intended to ground a scientific realism that would rely on the power of scientific knowledge and its evolving authority. Likewise, the pillars of political authority will be shaken, and the transformation will occur within the structure of political power and its hierarchy, such that whoever possesses knowledge becomes the one who makes decisions. The evidence lies in what we currently witness in the role of Silicon Valley companies as the centre of authority and controllers of the world. The authority of knowledge today is the basis of domination and the pillar of the economy, and the entire world is subject to its power. Toffler represents the highest form of authority. If force finds violence and rigidity and wealth finds dependency despite its flexibility, knowledge enhances resources, increases stakes, and constrains challenges. The wisdom of knowledge authority, from Toffler's perspective, lies in its balancing function, as if it were a rational power, and it remains the primary indicator in the struggle over authority at the global level today.¹³

4. Human beings and the world of tomorrow: changes and shocks

In *Future Shock*, Toffler presents an anticipatory vision oriented towards the future, specifically concerning the changes affecting human beings in the world of tomorrow as a result of the resounding current of change, in the form of a formidable techno-technological acceleration that has created a large gap between the human being and his reality, laden with questions about tomorrow and the burdens it imposes upon him. He highlights the difficult

position of the human being today in the face of the consequences of this change and the shocks it may cause, as this change constitutes the striking force of both the present and the future. The scientific outpouring and information explosion we witness today leave human beings perplexed and anxious; they are estranged and shocked, floundering in the maze of change that has begun to undermine our institutions and redraw our values.

The human being of today will find himself in a world he no longer recognises: '...many of the sanest people will collide with the future and many of the sons of the richest and most advanced nations will become richer and richer..., or, in other words, for these people the future will arrive faster than was expected'.¹⁴ The rates of continuous change are reflected in humans and in society as a whole, driving them towards loss and collective fragmentation as a result of their inability to adapt due to the 'shock'.

Toffler holds that the impact of the shock, 'future shock', will differ from one society to another. The accelerated change in advanced societies has caused individuals to stumble in the face of the prevailing wave of change, thereby weakening their capacity for adaptation and confrontation. By 'shock', he means the effect that befalls individuals in the form of fragmentation and disintegration in the face of the radical and rapid changes imposed upon them within a short period of time. In this sense, Toffler states, 'For the past three centuries, Western society has lived amid a fiery storm of change; instead of abating, this storm seems to be gathering its forces for an even more violent outburst...'.¹⁵

The waves of change have swept across industrial societies at great speed, leaving behind a multitude of contradictions and challenges and pushing them towards a perilous turning point with unforeseeable consequences. Change is no longer merely a technical acceleration; instead, it has begun to permeate the fabric of societies and the nerve of their driving relationships. This will affect the nature of individuals and cause the mind to turn

upon itself, producing psychological tremors that culminate in the disease of change, or the shock, as Toffler calls it, one of the most significant challenges facing human beings in the world of tomorrow. If the latter does not take caution and care, he will not, and will never, be spared the weight of continuous incapacity and chronic illness, and he will remain imprisoned within rotation and shock.¹⁶

To avoid the shock, Toffler recommends calming the situation and reducing the intensity of acceleration. Although the latter is a chronic malady from which it is difficult to recover, some solutions may nonetheless be anticipated by identifying the precursors of the shock, becoming aware of its problems, and preparing for it, by directing ongoing development through strengthening the power of constructive thinking and working to prepare the mind and the self for existing conditions, and by developing the capacity to adapt to change and tame it in the service of a better human future. However, the human being needs time to apprehend the new developments of the present reality; he cannot trifle with his nature, which imposes upon him a limited capacity for endurance, and thus, he will experience the shock sooner or later.

The optimal recovery solution is the capacity for adaptation on the basis of experience in simulating reality and conforms to it according to the principle of instrumentality. Humans must find the necessary ways and tools to confront the shock and resist its consequences. If a human being is unable to control rates of change, his or her fate will inevitably be collapsed and incapable. A person must therefore possess a high response capacity, which will affect their existence within their society. Toffler links human responsiveness to an individual's ability, as previously mentioned, to adapt. Shock is an inevitable matter, as the human being does not possess sufficient protection against it; however, they do possess awareness, and change makes us ever ready for every event, provided that we are conscious of and knowledgeable about what is happening.¹⁷

Humanity and Technological Acceleration: Stakes and Challenges Towards an Anticipatory Philosophical Vision in the Thought of the Alvin Toffler

According to Toffler, the solution also depends on cooperation in effectively accommodating the future, with a view to adaptation to avoid shock. Toffler distinguishes between culture shock and future shock, considering the former to concern placing the human being in an environment that is alien to him in terms of behaviour and customs. This is an unplanned shock that compels the individual to adopt a new culture and live with it. However, culture shock remains a relatively mild matter compared with future shock, which encompasses both psyche and the body; it is a psychological and social disorientation that makes it difficult to adapt to the new reality because of technological acceleration and sudden change.

This matter explores the concept of alienation, specifically in terms of human capacity and separation from themselves and the world. The concept of alienation is one of the most significant notions that have preoccupied many contemporary thinkers, such as Herbert Marcuse, who articulated a set of proposals that reframe our understanding of the human being's place in the present age and its attendant scientific and technological progress. He regards alienation as a psychological and social ordeal lived by contemporary human beings under rationality. Marcuse affirms that technological progress entrenches the foundations of an entire system of control, thereby creating a one-dimensional society. It renders the human being lost, drifting day after day away from truth, including the truth of his own existence, amid the maze of false needs. Thus, he accepts irrational and contradictory practices but considers them expressions of conformity and rationality, which reflects the symbolic power of industrial society over people.¹⁸

In any case, advanced countries remain more exposed to shock and alienation, as they are living the height of their civilisation in the context of technological acceleration and its repercussions. There are no fixed values, including the value of the human being himself, his

principles, morals, and existence. Mental functions are no longer an exclusively human attribute; instead, they have become a technological given that they are performed by technological means such as surveillance, information analysis, and administration. Consequently, human shocks will persist, and his relationship with his changing world will remain one of anxiety so long that there is something that prevents him from achieving adaptation. In light of this shortcoming, Toffler resorts to education, which makes the act of adaptation possible.

4.1 Education as a safeguard for the future

There is nothing that warrants more attention than education in meeting challenges, enabling adaptation, and organising societies, as it represents a winning card and a driving force for change and renewal, especially given that the human being stores knowledge and has an unlimited need for its benefits. Education will always remain a distance between the signifier and the signified, and this distance will expand or contract according to need. As the distance narrows, we will inevitably find ourselves in a state of total loss, leaving us with a tense interval that lays the foundations for the absence of awareness in the form of excess. There is, therefore, no escape from future shock except through awareness and education. In the first and second waves, human awareness followed the event and was formed without a prior alert; today, however, awareness precedes the event more than it follows it, owing to development. We must therefore create a safety margin to keep pace with events and control them with greater awareness, thereby understanding and anticipating the future instead of rejecting it.

For this reason, Toffler discerned the points of weakness in traditional education and linked its decline to the nature of schools, emphasising the role entrusted to these schools to resist and thus avoid the effects of shock. In the same context, he sees a need for congruence between the educational system and the age of technology in a way that surpasses

industrialism. To achieve this aim, it is necessary to devise working strategies, means, objectives, and curricula that move within the horizon of the future and do not remain anchored in the sterile classical aspect of the past and the decline in individuals' capacities it has left behind in the face of ongoing scientific progress. From Toffler's perspective, schools are witnessing the regression of a paralyzed system rather than aspiring to understand the reality of the new society.¹⁹

Among the pitfalls of classical education are its submission to curricula of conformity, obedience, and constant labour, especially in the second wave, that is, in industrial countries where the individual was turned into a machine mobilised to serve factories. This is the model required by the age of technological progress, particularly after the acceleration in the pursuit of economic profit, which has led to a set of material and social contradictions experienced by societies. Since technology is an inevitable matter, education must take this inevitability into account, but in the direction of new strategies that work to organise capacities that are consciously attuned to technology so that we may be in a state of psychological and physical readiness, which contributes to paralysing the impact of shocks. For this reason, Toffler turned to the quality of education and linked it to the capacity for adaptation and the possession of the requisites of speed, planning, and the building of the forces necessary to keep pace with continuous change, especially attentiveness: the greater the attentiveness, the greater the capacity to adapt and control rates of change, and the greater, likewise, the discernment of future events. The individual today is no longer imprisoned in the past and the present, which necessitates understanding and learning the course of change and keeping pace with it through probabilistic assumptions in the world of the near and very near future.²⁰

This necessitates the imposition of a future safeguard through learning. Toffler

envisaged an educational revolution that targeted methods and means and redrawn objectives by creating new, successive, and probabilistic advantages concerning the kinds of work that would frame tomorrow and be needed by society and by positing assumptions for various models, such as the family, relationships, the economy, etc., in addition to respecting the learner's desires and choices. It also involves devising new curricula and renewing existing curricula, together with the scientific organisation and evaluation required by ongoing technological progress, as well as the necessity of accelerated knowledge acquisition as the fuel and driving force behind that progress. Every rapid flow of knowledge demands more dynamic work for alerting and educating, thereby shortening the path of transition from one situation to another.²¹

In sum, education remains the decisive indicator and the necessary concrete factor for avoiding future shock through its transcendence of traditional methods and the formulation of a philosophy of new objectives that takes into account the use of simulation techniques for anticipating the future, far from the stereotypical nature of classical approaches, and through liberation from the cocoon of the past and the opening of horizons for free education outside regular classrooms. Education today, as Toffler predicted, encourages experience and entrenches a culture of diversity, distinction, and effectiveness “electronic education” in ways that facilitate the production of expertise, thereby contributing to creativity and innovation. This is, perhaps, what Toffler intended by the authority of knowledge as a means of avoiding shock, for what he sought through his institutional thought was a generation that innovated rather than merely knowing how to use innovations, “acquiring technology.”

If we limit our focusing on Toffler’s vision for the future with in the frame work of the current technological reality, as manifested in the post-industrial era to the phase of advanced technology, we find that Toffler anticipated the reality over whelming and continue us acceleration impacting humans, al though he didn’t analyze the exact human’s reality it self

but he talk more about many predictions and projection with its impact on the humanity and the social changing because of its shock in which he said the future shock, here he consider that the future will more faster than humans ability of adaption through education and flexibility.

It is know that Toffler is one among the most important contemporary thinkers and future it's beside Yuval Noah Harari (1976_?) and Nick Bostrom (1973_?) , and each of them has their own unique perspective for the human and his technological reality and specially the idea of the rapid pace of the future and society-technological change and the impact of this on human mentally, physically, socially in the future. Also the philosopher Noah Harari worked on enlarging his philosophical perspective to ward the analysis of human history based on the philosophy of future technology in which he alluded to the possibility of the surpassing of humans by algorithms, say the negative impact of technology and that the artificial intelligence itself is a danger on human existence and freedom.

The same theory was studied by the future its Bostrom who has been the most cautious about AE in which he considered it as on existential risk looming over humanity. So we can see that Toffler didn't criticize the technology, rather, he called for the necessity of adaption, looking for the AI together with the other technologies as a tool of a social change which is necessary for the development and he saw the future as a continuum of cultural evolution and advancement "three wares", Toffler didn't overlook, in this regard, the major problems and shocks of this development "future shocks".

5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Toffler's anticipatory vision, in the context of human and social inquiry, encompasses a set of ideas and predictions that lay the foundations for understanding the human condition amidst technological acceleration and the challenges and stakes it poses. In so doing, he has presented an institutional project through which he was able to extrapolate numerous issues, including the historicisation of human thought along an ascending trajectory in the form of waves of successive transformations that vary in intensity and

impact, expressing a marked distinctiveness in his deconstruction of the structure of these transformations, from the beginnings of their manifestation to the first signs of technology and culminating in the era of technological explosion with its sweeping speed under the weight of unstable change. Indeed, these readings and predictions were not mere theorising about the year of tomorrow; they have truly constituted the foundations of an intellectual school that has borne the banner of institutional work, and what we are living today is the best evidence of this.

Thus, Toffler predicted the frameworks and constituents of the technological age, as well as the extent of the contrast between the third wave and the two preceding waves, "agricultural" and "industrial." The formidable acceleration and the stakes and necessities it imposes at the level of industrialisation make it one of the factors by which the index of change and effectiveness, "the authority of power," is measured. This is perhaps due primarily to the stimulus of the capacity for adaptation and continuity in the midst of civilisational transformation and technological acceleration, which proceed steadily towards progress and development on the basis of the principles of science, knowledge, and work and according to the logic of evolution and change.

Toffler thus linked change, with all its stakes for quality of life and stability, to a logic grounded in experience and the capacity for adaptation. For this reason, he offered readers his famous trilogy: *Future Shock*, *The Third Wave*, and *PowerShift*, in which he explains the reality of tomorrow and all that concerns the future of the human being, as well as the changes that may be imposed upon him, compelling him to reorder his calculations in favour of technology. This renders human beings uncertain about their situation due to the increasing acceleration of technology in all domains of life, as well as its direct effects on the individual, as noted above. These effects, in short, involve rapid changes in their relationships, beliefs, values, and ideas. The human being of today lives in estrangement in a

world he ~~has never known, yet he is required to adapt to his present condition~~ to the point of falling ill. This is the shock, as Toffler calls it. Therefore, transformation affects not only the real world but also what is even more serious and far-reaching in its impact: the human being, the fabric of society, and all that pertains to its cultural, social, and political particularity.

Toffler also distinguishes, in the course of his discussion of shock, between future shock and culture shock. He regards the latter as having a lesser impact on the human psyche, even if it is accompanied by psychological symptoms whose consequences can be mitigated. Future shock, however, has both psychological and physical symptoms (anxiety, dizziness, discomfort, alienation, etc.). The world most exposed to shock is the advanced world, marked by change and instability, including changes in systems of values, as accelerating technology sweeps away everything, making the world one of constant change and transformation.

According to Toffler, this change will lead to a transformation in authority, shifting its structure towards a new type of domination: from the authority of wealth and force to the authority of knowledge, which will dominate the new world and its evolving reality. Material capital, the "authority of power", will thus be transformed into technological and knowledge capital as the foundation of authority, leading to a marked shaking of the pillars of power in its hierarchy, wherein knowledge will reach the height of its authority and survival will be the strongest, namely, those who know, innovate, and create in the field of technology, not merely those who know how to use it. The evidence lies in the lag of some states, despite their use of technology, such as the United Arab Emirates. This is, in short, a matter of the authority of knowledge. In this way, Toffler refounded authority on what is more powerful

and more affluent, namely, knowledge, which he regarded as the authority that balances both the authority of power and that of wealth.

For this reason, Toffler emphasises the role of education and knowledge in avoiding shock and regulating relations since, from his perspective, awareness is the basis for alerting us to the world of tomorrow and its future, drawn along by the force of technology. Toffler also stakes his hopes on the role of electronic education and the prospects of work in the context of technological acceleration, considering planning for the future to be one of the indicators of controlling it and avoiding its shocks.

5. Bibliography List :

- ¹ (Khalid Abd al-Latif Muhammad Imran, *Techniques for teaching and learning social studies in the age of information and the communications revolution: A contemporary educational vision* (1st ed.). Jordan: Al-Riwaq Publishing House. 2012, p. 120.
- ² (Bashar Jamil, 2013, *Globalisation: Philosophical backgrounds and intellectual confrontations*. Egypt: World of Thought journal, National Council for Culture, Arts, and Literature, 41(3).p. 150.
- ³ (Belakroun, *Transformations of contemporary philosophical thought: Questions of concept, meaning, and communication* (1st ed.). Algeria: Ikhtilaf Publications, 2009, p. 260.
- ⁴ (Toffler, *The Third Wave* (Trans. Issam al-Sheikh Qasim). Libya: Jamahiriyya Publishing House. 1990, p. 430.
- ⁵ (Toffler, *Future Shock* (2nd ed., Trans. Muhammad Ali Nasif). Egypt: Dar al-Nahda. 1990, p. 17.
- ⁶ (Rashad Nabil, *Futures studies: An anticipatory vision towards the future*. Iraq: Dar al-Shu'un al-Thaqafiyyah. 2013, p. 43.
- ⁷ (Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Abdallah, *Sociology: Origin and development*. Egypt: Dar al-Ma'rifa al-Jami'iyya.1999, p. 211.
- ⁸ (Toffler, *ibid*, 1990, p. 309)
- ⁹ (Toffler, *Building a new civilisation* (Trans. Saad Zahran, 1st ed.). Egypt: Al-Mahrousa Centre. 1996, pp. 22–24.
- ¹⁰ (Toffler, *ibid*, 1990, p. 226).
- ¹¹ (Toffler, *PowerShift* (Trans. Lubna al-Zaydi). Egypt: Egyptian General Book Organisation.1995, pp. 17–21.
- ¹² (Toffler, 1995, pp. 18–23).
- ¹³ (Toffler, *ibid*, 1995, p. 42).
- ¹⁴ (Toffler, *ibid*, 1990, p. 23)
- ¹⁵ (Toffler, *ibid*, 1990, p. 9).
- ¹⁶ (Reda Abbas Batoul, *The present of the contemporary world and our future*. Iraq: Dar Dijla.2010, p. 68.
- ¹⁷ (Nabil Rashad, 2013, p. 148).
- ¹⁸ (Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man* (Trans. George Tarabishi). Lebanon: Dar al-Adab. 1969, p. 55.
- ¹⁹ (Toffler, *Future Shock*. New York: Random House. 1970, p. 399.
- ²⁰ (Toffler, *ibid*, 1970, p. 401.
- ²¹ (Toffler, *ibid*, 1990, p. 49.